



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/039,279	01/04/2002	Rajendra S. Yavatkar	10559-568001 / P12782	8329

20985 7590 09/04/2007
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

HALIYUR, VENKATESH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2616

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/04/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/039,279

Applicant(s)

YAVATKAR ET AL.

Examiner

Venkatesh Haliyur

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION:

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 54-91 (claims 16-53 are canceled) is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 54-91 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on 07/03/2007 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome Subramanian et al. and Reeves et al. references. Rejections follow.
2. Claims 1-15, 54-91 are pending in the application. Claims 16-53 are canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-2,6,10,12-15,54-55,58,61-91, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Subramanian et al. [US Pat: 6,970,943].

Regarding claims 1,69, Subramanian et al in the invention of " Routing Architecture Including A Compute Plane Configured For High Speed Processing of Packets to Provide Application Layer Support" disclosed (**Figs 1-4, col 1,lines 60-67, col 3,lines 10-67, col 4,lines 1-45**) a router (**item 10 of Fig 6**) using a distributed

Art Unit: 2616

implementation of a routing control protocol to route a packet between a plurality of computer networks (**col 1, lines 60-67, col 2, lines 1-46**), comprising: a control-plane (**control plane, item 12 of Fig 6**) having a control-plane processor (**control processor, item 28 of Fig 6**) to implement a central control portion of the control protocol (**col 4, lines 21-32, col 5, lines 3-13**); a plurality of forwarding-planes (**forwarding planes 1....N, items 16 of Fig 6**), each having a forwarding-plane processor (**item 48 of Fig 6, col 7, lines 28-67**) to implement an offload control portion of the control protocol (**control message processing is separated from computing task, col 2, lines 29-41, col 8, lines 14-37**) and a plurality of ports (**network interface, items 52 of Fig 6**) to connect the router to the computer networks (**col 6, lines 16-67**); and a back-plane (**switching backplane, item 26 of Fig 6**) to connect the control plane (**item 12 of Fig 6**) to the plurality of forwarding-planes (**items 16 of Fig 6**) and to enable processing of the packet based on an implementation of the control protocol by the control-plane and the forwarding-plane (**col 6, lines 16-67, Fig 5**) [**col 7, lines 1-67, col 8, lines 1-67, col 9, lines 1-33**].

Regarding claims 2,70,55,66,70,80,88, Subramanian et al disclosed that the offload control portion (**control message processing**) of the control protocol generates an outgoing control message [**col 4, lines 21-32, col 5, lines 3-13, col 6, lines 45-57**].

Regarding claim 6,58,67,71,81,89, Subramanian et al disclosed that the offload control portion (**control message processing**) of the control protocol responds to an incoming request to the control protocol (**col 4, lines 21-32, col 6, lines 45-65, Figs 4-5**).

Regarding claim 10,61,72,78,86, Subramanian et al disclosed that the control-plane and the forwarding-plane together implement a plurality of control protocols (**Fig 5, col 5, lines 3-41,col 6, lines 16-65,**).

Regarding claim 12,73,82, Subramanian et al disclosed that the plurality of ports include a plurality of virtual interfaces (**RTP over UDP port**) on a physical interface (**col 2, lines 5-46,col 3, lines 29-42, col 5, lines 25-41**).

Regarding claim 13,68,74,83,90, Subramanian et al disclosed that the forwarding-plane processor includes: a processing engine (**Forwarding rules/filter, item 50 of Fig 6**) to implement a plurality of packet processing functions for routing the packet (**item 48 of Fig 6, col 7, lines 28-67**); and a general purpose processor (**compute plane processors, item 36 of Fig 6**) to implement the offload control portion of the control protocol (**col 3, lines 54-61, Fig 3**).

Regarding claims 14-15, 63-64,75-76,84,91,Subramanian et al disclosed that the off-load control portion of the control protocol operates to reduce a control flow load on the back-plane between the control-plane (**Fig 5, col 6, lines 16-65**) and the forwarding plane (**col 8, lines 1-26**) and also to reduce a processing load on the control-plane processor (**col 2, lines 29-41, col 8,lines 49-67, col 9, lines 1-24**).

Regarding claims 54,65,69, Subramanian et al disclosed a method of processing a packet between two or more computer networks using a distributed implementation of a control protocol (**col 1,lines 60-67, col 2, lines 1-46**), comprising: implementing a central control portion of a control protocol in a control-plane (**control plane, item 12 of Fig 6**) of a router (**item 10 of Fig 6**) and an offload control portion of

Art Unit: 2616

the control protocol in a forwarding-plane (**forwarding plane, item 16 of Fig 6**) of the router (**col 4, lines 21-32, col 5, lines 3-13, col 8, lines 14-37**), the control-plane and forwarding plane being connected to each other by a back-plane (**switching back plane, item 26 of Fig 6**); and processing the packet based on an implementation of the control protocol by the control- plane and the forwarding-plane (**col 6, lines 16-67**) [**col 7, lines 1-67, col 8, lines 1-67, col 9, lines 1-33, Figs 3-5**].

Regarding claims 77,85, Subramanian et al disclosed a control-plane (**control plane, item 12 of Fig 6**) for a router (**item 10 of Fig 6**) using a distributed implementation of a routing control protocol to route a packet (**col 1, lines 60-67, col 2, lines 1-46**), comprising: a control-plane processor (**control processor, item 28 of Fig 6**) to implement a first control portion of the control protocol and interact with a plurality of forwarding-planes (**forwarding planes 1....N, items 16 of Fig 6**), which implement a second control portion of the control protocol, to enable processing of the packet by the router (**col 4, lines 21-32, col 6, lines 16-65, Fig 5**).

Regarding claim 79,87, Subramanian et al disclosed a forwarding-plane (**forwarding plane, item 16 of Fig 6**) for a router (**item 10 of Fig 6**) using a distributed implementation of a routing control protocol to route a packet (**Fig 5**), comprising: a forwarding-plane processor (**forwarding processor, item 48 of Fig 6**) to implement an offload control portion of the control protocol (**col 2, lines 29-41, col 8, lines 14-37**) and interact with a control-plane (**control plane, item 12 of Fig 6**), which implements a central control portion of the control protocol, to enable processing of the packet by the router (**col 4, lines 21-32, col 6, lines 16-65, Fig 5**).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3-5,7-9,11,56-57,59-60,62 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramanian et al. [US Pat: 6,970,943] in view of Reeves et al. [US 2002/0071390].

Regarding claims 3,7,56,59,60, Subramanian et al. in the invention of " Routing Architecture Including A Compute Plane Configured For High Speed Processing of Packets to Provide Application Layer Support" disclosed the router (**item 10 of Fig 6**) and methods for processing plurality of control protocols and messages (**col 5, lines 3-41**), but fails to disclose that control protocol is OPEN SHORTEST PATH FIRST (OSPF) protocol and outgoing control message is a HELLO message, the incoming request is a LSA request message and the incoming request is a link status request message. However, Reeves et al in the invention of "System and Method for Establishing a Communication Path Associated with an MPLS Implementation on an ATM Platform" disclosed MPLS routing system (**Fig 5, para 0006, 0038-0059**) for processing plurality of control protocols and messages including OSPF (**para 0048**) protocol and to send or receive HELLO messages for session establishment (**para**

0088-0089) and the incoming request is a link status request messages (**para 0065**).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary in the art at the time the invention was made to include OSPF protocol and to send or receive HELLO and link status request messages as taught by Reeves et al. in the system of Subramanian et al. to process OPEN SHORTEST PATH FIRST (OSPF) protocol and outgoing HELLO control message, incoming LSA request message and link status request messages. One is motivated as such in order to increase the throughput of forwarding plane processor by offloading OSPF control message processing to control plane during session establishment, maintenance and termination of data paths.

Regarding claims 4-5,8-9,11,57,62, Subramanian et al. disclosed the router (**item 10 of Fig 6**) processing plurality of control protocol including RESOURCE RESERVATION (RSVP) protocol and associated RESV and PATH messages (**col 5, lines 3-63**) for path establishment, but fails to disclose the router processing OSPF, INTRA-DOMAIN INTERMEDIATE SYSTEM TO INTERMEDIATE SYSTEM ROUTING PROTOCOL (ISIS) control protocols and the associated outgoing control message is a HELLO message and the incoming request message is a HELLO request. However, Reeves et al disclosed MPLS routing system (**Fig 5, para 0006, 0038-0059**) for processing plurality of control protocols and messages including OSPF, ISIS (**para 0048**) protocol and to send or receive HELLO messages for session establishment (**para 0088-0089**) and the incoming request is a link status request messages (**para 0065**). Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary in the art at the time the invention was made to include OSPF, ISIS protocols and to send or receive HELLO

messages as taught by Reeves et al. in the system of Subramanian et al. to process OSPF, ISIS control protocol messages and outgoing HELLO control messages. One is motivated as such in order to increase the throughput of forwarding plane processor by offloading OSPF, RSVP, ISIS control message processing to control plane during session establishment, maintenance and termination of data paths.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments, see remark, filed on 07/03/2007 with respect to claims 1-15,54-91 have been considered but is not persuasive.

a. With respect to applicant(s) argument that Subramanian et al references does not teach or suggest that forwarding planes implement an offload portion of a control protocol and would not have made obvious forwarding planes having a forwarding-plane processor to implement an offload control portion of the control protocol as recited in claims 1,54,65,69,77,79,85,87, however the examiner respectfully traverses the applicant(s) to col 8, lines 14-37, where Subramanian et al disclosed that the forwarding plane processors (items 48 of Fig 6) of forwarding planes (items 16 of Fig 6) implementing select forwarding rules and packet filtering functions on the incoming packets thereby teaching or suggesting the forwarding planes implementing an offload portion of a control protocol. Hence it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art that the

forwarding planes having a forwarding-plane processor to implement an offload control portion of the control protocol.

b. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, i.e., forwarding planes implement an offload portion of a control protocol as recited in the rejected claim(s), however the rejected claims 1,54, 65, 69, 77, 79,85,87 do not recite what portion of the control protocol is processed by the forwarding plane processor that is considered as an offload portion of the control protocol. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

8. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2616

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to the attention to Venkatesh Haliyur whose phone number is 571-272-8616. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached @ (571)-272-7884. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (571)-272-2600 or fax to 571-273-8300.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

Venkatesh Haliyur

Patent Examiner

UH 08/23/07

EDAN D. ORGAD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Edan Orgad 8/30/07